ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 6/1/65 | DATE RECEIVED

1. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO.	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
257	80&2	N.A.

4. AUTHOR(S):
N.A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Faculty Personnel for the Two Year Colleges: Proceedings of a Regional Conference sponsored by the New England Board of Higher Education

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:

7. EDITOR(S):
Gusdorf, John W. ed.

8. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
New England Board of Higher Edu.

9. PLACE OF ORIGIN
NEBHE
ORG. 31 Church Street
ST. Winchester, Mass.
CITY, STATE

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	61	51

TELE. NET/LO. CODE | EXT

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES X NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO X

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL X
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

2. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
Conference

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

higher edu.	faculty	qualifications
junior colleges	conferences	graduate edu.
personnel	degrees	recruitment

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 150 WORDS)

A collection of four short speeches which discuss the problem of adequate personnel for the 2-year colleges. The history and aim of the junior college is presented, along with degree requirements for the teaching staff. Summaries of conference discussion sections center around the identification of promising junior college teachers, the graduate preparation of junior college teachers, and faculty development in the junior colleges.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT
Reporter No. 6

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

FACULTY PERSONNEL

FOR THE

TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Proceedings of a
Regional Conference
Sponsored by the
NEW ENGLAND BOARD
OF HIGHER EDUCATION

MAY 26, 1960

ED 000257

8082

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

FACULTY PERSONNEL FOR THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Proceedings of a Regional Conference

Sponsored by the

NEW ENGLAND BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

May 26, 1960

Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts

Edited by

JOHN W. GUSTAD, *Director*
College Teacher Program

* * *

Winchester, Massachusetts
1960

FOREWORD

The New England Board of Higher Education was established in 1955 under the New England Higher Education Compact, which each New England state has joined by vote of its legislature. Its purpose is to improve and increase the educational opportunities in higher education, both public and private, for the youth of New England.

In its brief period of operation, NEBHE has already made significant contributions to this objective. The Board quickly recognized, however, that one of the most critical problems facing higher education in the region — and indeed throughout the entire nation — is the shortage of qualified college teachers. Out of this recognition came the decision to place major emphasis on the college teacher problem.

In the spring of 1959 funds for a one-year exploratory program were granted to NEBHE by the Carnegie Corporation. In August, the program was officially inaugurated with the appointment of Dr. John W. Gustad as director.

As stated in its bylaws, the Board " . . . shall provide a facility and a staff for continuous assessment of needs in higher education within New England and for assisting in developing plans and programs to meet those needs." The key word is "assisting." The Board does not have any control or authority over any of New England's colleges or universities. Rather, its job is to help others help themselves — and to help one another. Both the Board and staff appreciate the high degree of cooperation already manifested by representatives of the region's colleges, and they look forward with keen anticipation to the prospect of continuing to work with New England's educational leaders on this most crucial problem.

ROBERT H. KROEPSCH,
Executive Secretary.

PREFACE

In earlier conferences sponsored as part of the College Teacher Program, three general sets of faculty personnel problems were considered: supply, demand, and recruitment; preparation and orientation; utilization and retention. Because the terms of the grant supporting the College Teacher Program limited it primarily to the accredited, four-year colleges and universities in New England, these earlier conferences were attended by representatives from and dealt with the problems of these institutions.

To a certain extent, of course, there is a good deal of communality about faculty personnel problems. It makes comparatively little difference in many cases whether one is concerned with private unversities, state universities, liberal arts colleges, technical institutions, or teachers colleges. At the same time, it was recognized that the recent rapid growth in the numbers and sizes of two-year institutions create for them some problems not entirely the same as those encountered in the other kinds of institutions. It was a recognition of this fact, coupled with a realization of the increasing importance of two-year institutions in the educational scene, that led the New England Board of Higher Education, through its College Teacher Program, to plan and carry out a conference dealing with faculty personnel for the two-year colleges.

The response from the two-year colleges was most favorable. Several presidents contributed generously of their time in helping to make plans for the conference. To these individuals go our sincere gratitude. In addition, Drs. Ralph Fields and Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., two of the country's foremost authorities in the area, consented to take part in the conference, thereby adding immeasurably to it. To them and to the others who took part in the program we are all grateful.

Special thanks are due to President Nils Y. Wessell and Provost Leonard C. Mead of Tufts University, as well as to their staff members, for agreeing to serve as hosts for the conference. The facilities and services provided by them were excellent and helped greatly to foster an atmosphere in which productive discussion of important issues could take place. Finally, the conference would not have been possible without the devoted efforts and support of: the Carnegie Corporation of New York for its support of the entire College Teacher Program; the professional and secretarial staff of NEBHE; finally, but not least, the representatives of the two-year colleges who came to the conference and contributed so much to the discussions.

There was no thought, when this conference was being planned, that a set of rules or procedures could be laid down which would, if followed assiduously, solve the faculty personnel problems of the two-year colleges. Rather, the goal was to stimulate thinking and discussion of these problems so that new and better ideas might in time emerge. It was hoped also that this presentation of the personnel problems of a significant segment of higher education would stimulate others, notably those concerned with teacher preparation, to keep the two-year colleges in mind.

For many, many students, education beyond the high school that is appropriate to their talents and interests is best provided for in the two-year colleges. It is essential that everything that can be done be done to insure that the education provided in these institutions is in fact "higher" and is of unquestioned quality. For this to be so, many more well-trained teachers are needed.

JOHN W. GUSTAD, *Director*
College Teacher Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	2
Preface	3
Regional and National Developments in the Two-Year College — Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.	7
Panel: Faculty Needs in the Two-Year College	
Introduction by the Chairman — Eugene M. Austin	17
Faculty for a Two-Year College for Women — Edward Y. Blewett	19
Faculty for a Technical Institute — Harold Bentley	22
Faculty for a Community College — Thomas E. O'Connell	27
Graduate Preparation for Junior College Teaching — Ralph R. Fields	33
Summaries of Discussion Sections:	
I. Identifying Promising Junior College Teachers — Leonard C. Mead, Chairman; Dorothy Bell, Recorder	45
II. Graduate Preparation for Junior College Teachers — Ralph R. Fields, Chairman; M. K. Peterson, Recorder	48
III. Faculty Development in the Junior Colleges — Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Chairman; Robert C. Weller, Recorder	50
Roster of Participants	52

REGIONAL AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR.
Executive Director
American Association of Junior Colleges

This is a background presentation for our discussion of faculty needs for two-year colleges and the graduate preparation for junior college teachers. No state or region can exist unto itself and it is in recognition of this fact that the planners of this conference have felt it essential to place the discussions in a context of national developments.

National Growth in Junior College Enrollment

Junior colleges continue to grow in enrollments and in the number of institutions. The United States Office of Education reports that in the fall of 1958, 22.4 per cent of first-time enrollments in degree-credit programs in all collegiate institutions was in the junior colleges. Thirty per cent of first-time college students enrolling in degree-credit programs in publicly supported institutions enrolled in junior colleges. The Annual *Directory*[1] of the American Association of Junior Colleges recognizes other functions beyond degree-credit programs and in its latest issue reported an enrollment of 679,266 as of October 15, 1958 and a total enrollment for the year 1958–59 of 905,062. Four hundred publicly supported junior colleges and 277 private junior colleges were included in the report.

There is a great deal of variation in the proportion of students entering junior colleges as one surveys the states and regions. The Board of Control of the State of Florida reported that in Escambia County in which Pensacola is located that nine out of ten persons beginning their college

[1] 1960 *Junior College Directory*, Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Editor, American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington 6, D. C.

careers entered junior colleges. In several states such as Michigan, Mississippi, California, and New York, as well as some others, there is a reasonable expectation that within a few years at least half of the beginning college students will go to junior and community colleges.

California has done more with junior colleges to date than any other state. In the college year 1958–59, California junior colleges (public) enrolled 73.3% of all full-time students enrolled in public higher education below the junior year. This past year there were 92,000 full-time students in the junior colleges. By 1975, it is estimated that there will be 300,000. But California is not the only state in which there is this remarkable growth. To refer to Florida again — last year, in those 26 counties where the services of public junior colleges are available 75% of the students enrolling in college for the first time chose the junior college.

And in New York — in 1950 there was established the first locally sponsored community college. There were 257 full-time students — nine years later there are 13,000 full-time students. During this same period a total of $58,000,000 of construction has been completed or is under contract. Operating budgets for this year will probably be around $12,000,000.

In 1900 there were about eight institutions recognized as junior colleges. In 1959 there were 667. Dr. S. V. Martorana of the United States Office of Education analyzed statewide studies of higher education that were made between 1950 and 1957 and identified 27 studies which gave some attention to the two-year college. Twenty of those studies favored two-year colleges by some specific and positive declaration. It seems safe to say that junior college enrollment will expand at least as rapidly and very likely more rapidly than enrollments in other institutions of higher education during the next ten years.

Apparently there is some positive relationship between population growth in the states and their interests in junior

colleges. During the years 1950–1957 Florida increased 50.6 per cent in civilian population; California, 30.1 per cent, Michigan 20.9 per cent and Texas 18.5 per cent. These states are leaders in the junior college field.

New England Developments

Now let us look at New England:

State	% Change in Civilian Population 1950-1959
Maine	+ 1.2
Vermont	— 2.5
New Hampshire	+ 6.5
Massachusetts	+ 2.4
Rhode Island	+ 6.9
Connecticut[2]	+ 12.8

Population pressures apparently will not be as great in the New England states if the last several years serve as a reliable guide to the future. However, studies made recently in some of the New England states clearly indicate unmet needs in post-secondary education.

Connecticut

In a recent address to the Connecticut Council on Higher Education, Dr. James H. Halsey, President of the University of Bridgeport, cited estimates that between 5,000 and 23,000 of Connecticut's qualified young people would have to be turned away from the state's colleges on the basis of estimated facilities by 1965. Dr. Halsey proposed that the University of Connecticut should become an upper-division institution offering courses only on the junior-senior and graduate levels. Under his plan only students who have completed satisfactorily a two-year freshman-sophomore program elsewhere would be eligible to attend the University of Connecticut.

President Halsey further proposed that the State Board of Education and the State University, in cooperation, should establish a statewide system of community junior

[2] Office of Statistical Information and Research, A *Fact Book* on Higher Education, American Council on Education, page 29.

college transfer programs, using in all instances existing institutions, both public and private. A scholarship program was suggested which would be authorized by the General Assembly.[3]

Incidentally, effective July 1, 1959 boards of education in the State of Connecticut were authorized to maintain tax-supported junior colleges.

Rhode Island

In Rhode Island it has been recommended to the General Assembly "that the State plan the establishment of community colleges to meet the educational needs that will not be met by the expansion of the State's privately supported colleges or by the expansion of the two State supported colleges. . . ."

The Board of Trustees of State Colleges has stated that "for the foreseeable future, three Community Colleges, strategically located, will serve the needs of the State for this type of educational program." Starting in 1962 with one new college and adding others at two-year intervals the base initial projections of enrollment would be about 500 students in each unit. The Commission to Study Higher Education suggested that these institutions enroll approximately 6,500 students by 1980.

Massachusetts

Massachusetts estimates an increase in college-age population of more than 50 per cent during the next eight years. By 1967 there will be about 372,000 in this age group as compared with 245,000 at the present. If the same proportion wish to go to college, an estimated 31,000 graduates of Massachusetts high schools would have no college places according to recent studies. If the proportion going to college increases, the need will be greater. Present

[3] Address given at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Connecticut Council on Higher Education, Central Connecticut State College, New Britain, Connecticut, April 28, 1960.

capacity of both public and private institutions plus planned expansion leaves the estimated 31,000 students for whom no college places will be available. The Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges has been appointed by the Governor and in a report dated December 31, 1959, proposes the early establishment of three "pilot" community colleges with others to follow. Berkshire Community College is to open in September. Eight community college regions have been studied.

Clearly there is a degree of growth in junior college enrollments to be anticipated in the New England area which justifies early attention to the recruitment and preparation of junior college teachers.

Teacher Supply and Demand

The *Junior College Directory* for 1958–59 lists 20,003 full-time junior college teachers throughout the country and 13,393 part-time teachers with a full-time equivalent of 24,022. The 1955 *Directory* listed only 12,213 full-time and 11,211 part-time. Five per cent of the total full-time faculty are located in New England as follows:

	Full Time	Part Time
Connecticut	188	252
Maine	101	32
Massachusetts	605	250
New Hampshire	43	4
Rhode Island	10	31
Vermont	80	4
Total	1,027	573

There is a reasonable expectation that expansion of junior colleges in other parts of the nation will affect the supply of teachers in New England. For example, of the new teachers in California junior colleges in 1957–58 there were 15.8 per cent who came from out of state. One year later the out-of-state number had risen to 23.1 per cent. California has made consistent studies of college staff needs and of characteristics of the new teachers. Estimates have

been made of full-time equivalent new staff needs by 1970:[4]

Junior Colleges	15,620
State Colleges	12,185
University	9,345
Private Colleges and Universities	5,294

California now reports 6,597 full-time equivalent junior college teachers. To find these teachers the administrators from the West Coast will be making more frequent trips to the east.

Dr. Mode L. Stone, Dean, School of Education, Florida State University, states that he estimates most conservatively that there will be an annual need in Florida, at least for the next ten years, of 100 qualified community junior college teachers. In his words:

> "The master plan that was developed calls according to various degrees of priority for twenty-five junior colleges. I have no doubt that the realization of this plan will come before we are able to view it from the detachment and objectivity of our retirements. These junior colleges will come in our lifetime and because of this we will have to shoulder full responsibility for their establishment and staffing. The staffing of these colleges will be one of the most trying tasks that will face us. It will be challenging because we must plan for the staffing of these colleges during a period when every kind of statistical factor will be working against us."[5]

Competition for Available Supply

There is another interesting feature about the need to staff a growing number of junior colleges. The largest source of junior college teachers in many states has been the high school teaching field. In California in 1957–58

[4] A study of Faculty Demand and Supply in California Higher Education, 1957–1970. Prepared for the Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the California State Board of Education. Berkeley and Sacramento, 1958.

[5] "Teachers for the Community Junior Colleges of Florida," Proceedings of Sixth Annual Junior College Conference, Tallahassee, Florida, November 22–23, 1957.

of the 457 new staff who came from prior teaching positions, 271 or 59% came from high schools. In 1958–59 of 496 new staff from prior teaching positions 225 came from high schools (45%). Nationally the same situation is evident. The Research Division of the National Education Association reports that the largest group of new teachers, 31.1 per cent of the total, came directly from high school teaching positions the preceding year. Next were those who came directly from graduate school, 20.1 per cent of the total. However, it is not only the junior college that draws upon high school teachers. According to this same report, "The high school teaching corps continues to be an important source of new teachers. Teachers colleges take almost one third of their new teachers from this source, state colleges about 1 of every 5, and the smaller nonpublic colleges draw upon the high school staff at a more-than-average rate."[6]

There will be increasing competition for new teachers from this source. How will junior colleges fare in the competition? There is a basic problem which must be reckoned with. According to Leland Medsker in his recent book, *The Junior College, Progress and Prospect*,[7]

> " . . . Needless to say, another immediate task is the procurement and training of teachers and counselors for the two-year college. This will not be accomplished easily, either quantitatively or qualitatively. One of the difficulties will be to find and prepare teachers whose image of themselves as staff members of a two-year college is in harmony with the distinctive purposes of this type of college rather than with some other type. Even the most adequate preparation of teachers is incomplete if their attitudes toward the junior college are incompatible with its purposes."

---

[6] "Teacher Supply and Demand in Universities, Colleges, and Junior Colleges, 1957–58 and 1958–59." Research Division National Education Association, Washington, D. C.

[7] "The Junior College, Progress and Prospect," Leland L. Medsker, University of California, Berkeley. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

There is some evidence, as Medsker indicates at other points in his book, that many teachers in junior colleges tend to identify themselves with the 4-year institutions and this might be an important factor in recruitment.

Problems in Staffing

Dr. James Reynolds, Editor of the *Junior College Journal*, described to a small group which met in New York two years ago under a grant from the Fund for Advancement of Education, some of the problems he perceived in the staffing of junior colleges.

> "Junior colleges will experience the same staff problems as other institutions of higher education, and even more serious problems due to the two factors which are unique with them. Staff procurement among junior colleges, moreover, will differ from other colleges and universities because of certain basic differences in the nature of the junior college.
>
> "The junior college concerns itself exclusively with teaching and service. This exclusion of the third function of higher education, research, implies a need for staff members whose preparation has not been devoted to the development of ability in the fields of research. In essence, this reduces materially the need for junior college instructors with the Ph.D. degree.
>
> "The seeming simplification of the problem of staff procurement faced by junior colleges as described in the preceding paragraph, however, is offset by the nature of the teaching responsibilities of junior college faculty members. Four aspects of these teaching responsibilities will illustrate the point:
>
> "(1) the introductory and general education nature of the academic program in junior colleges requires teachers who have depth of understanding in several subject matter fields as contrasted with

the narrower specialization that characterizes the preparation of many teachers in four-year colleges;

"(2) the wider range of abilities, aptitudes, interests, and goals of junior college students requires greater proficiency by the faculty in the matter of instruction;

"(3) the continued, even increased, incidence of vocational education in junior colleges requires teachers for these classes, and teachers of academic classes who understand the importance of such non-academic programs, and

"(4) the increasing importance of counseling and guidance which will occur in junior colleges requires faculty members who can contribute effectively to such services.

"Additionally, in contrast to serving educational needs derived from broad geographical areas, the junior college must give considerable attention to the educational needs of the locality which it serves. This stems from the fact that junior colleges are essentially local in their character. This condition implies a requirement that faculty members in junior colleges must be able to look at the immediate locality as a source for determining some of the educational services to be provided."

Dr. Ralph Tyler, Director of the Center for the Advanced Study of the Behavior Sciences said about the same thing at a recent convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges. He concluded his remarks with a comment of relevance to this group:

"Meeting the teaching obligation of the junior college is not easy. You have no adequate traditions to guide you. You cannot obtain staff members already fully prepared to discharge this responsibility."[8]

[8] "The Teaching Obligation," Ralph W. Tyler, *The Junior College Journal*, v. 30, no. 9. The University of Texas. May 1960.

Profession Preparation for Junior College Teaching

It seems perfectly clear to me that steps are now in order to recognize junior college teaching as a profession and that there must be specific preparation of persons to teach in these institutions. Developments now under way in several universities in the field of junior college administration ought to be accompanied with similar activities in teacher preparation.

The words of Professor Algo Henderson in regard to junior college administration have equal application to the teaching field.

> "The concept of the community junior college has changed radically during the half-century of its existence, and with this change has come the need of more imaginative and versatile leadership. What formerly was a job as the principal of a preparatory program has become a role as educational leader, as community leader, and as the executive of a complex enterprise with many facets of management relating to personnel, program, plant, finance and public relations. It has become highly important that this educational leadership shall be exercised with the social vision and the professional understanding needed to implement the new concept."

Junior and community college administrators come from varied backgrounds. So do teachers. We assume that administrators ought to have given attention to junior college philosophy in some formal way. Is there any less need for such study by junior college teachers? The establishment of many new colleges as well as certain weaknesses and problems in the junior college identified through recent studies emphasize need for university training programs for administrators. The need is surely as great for university programs directly concerned with the preparation and continuing improvement of junior college teachers.

Grants have now been made to seven universities to establish Junior College Leadership Programs.

These institutions are U. C. L. A., University of California at Berkeley, Stanford University, University of Texas, Florida State University, University of Florida, and Teachers College, Columbia University. There is a possibility that another program will be established at a university in the Middle West. A subcommittee of the AAJC Commission on Administration is working with representatives of the university centers. Very few universities are now conducting in a systematic and organized way programs for the preparation of junior college teachers which would in any way be similar to those under process of establishment in the field of administration. The University of California at Berkeley does have a junior college graduate internship program in teacher education which is being financed by the Fund for the Advancement of Education. The Program has been in operation only one year and the first report has just been published. It is well worth examining as a possible pattern for successful preparation of highly qualified men and women who might otherwise not enter the teaching profession.

It is high time that meetings of this kind be held, not only in New England, but in other sections of the country. I believe that the basic obligation of the junior college is to be a superior teaching institution. It is my hope that over the next several years reasons cited by students for attending community junior colleges will be more than geographical proximity and financial accessibility but that there shall be added this one — "I am going to a junior college because its primary aim is masterful classroom instruction."

We are here to discuss the steps that ought to be taken to assure that junior colleges establish a reputation as institutions of higher education in which superior teaching is the rule.

PANEL

FACULTY NEEDS IN THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Introduction by the Chairman

EUGENE M. AUSTIN
President, Colby Junior College

I know that I speak for all the delegates from the two-year colleges when I express our common appreciation for this conference.

Each generation presents its unique problems to higher education. Some of us can recall a time when the recruitment of students was the prime concern of all administrators. Not enough Americans of those days considered post high school education as financially possible, with the result that every college was hard put to it to fill its dormitories and pay its teachers. Happily, that is not one of our major problems today; and instead, we are faced with the problem of selecting the best among the many applicants. Another problem which has been a continuing one for most four-year colleges and universities has been that of balancing the budget. What I am about to say may be something which many of my colleagues may think I ought not to say in an open conference; but I think I shall say it anyway. Because of the possibility of teaching our students in well-balanced sections and using our faculty to their full capacity, the two-year colleges do not have the problem of budget-balancing that the senior institutions face, with small seminar groups and greater emphasis upon research. Our biggest problem in the past has been to secure the financial backing we have needed for physical plant. Because of the fact that the junior college has not been well known and its potential not fully appreciated, the normal sources of financial support — the foundations, industry and philan-

thropic individuals — have not been available to us. This handicap, however, is rapidly disappearing; and many junior college presidents are finding that it is possible to secure substantial support for their programs of bricks-and-mortar expansion from these sources.

The one increasing problem which the two-year colleges will be facing during the next decade is the increasing shortage of qualified teachers. This, to be sure, will constitute a continuing crisis in all higher education; but the junior colleges are faced with specific aspects of the problem which are unique to our own type of education. It is these special problems which will become clearer, I should hope, as this panel discussion continues.

FACULTY FOR A TWO-YEAR COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

EDWARD Y. BLEWETT
President, Westbrook Junior College

We have been asked to speak directly and personally out of our experience. Since my experience in junior college education is meager, being limited to but two years in the field, I hesitate to draw upon it. However, as many of you know, I have been living in the New England College world in another manifestation for several years and it is from that experience I wish to speak.

Some eight or ten years ago the New England Junior College Council invited fifteen or twenty of us from liberal arts colleges and universities to meet with them at luncheon in Boston in order that they might describe their peculiar need for teachers: a need which was peculiar because it differs from the need of other types of higher educational institutions.

I had almost no correct knowledge of junior colleges at the time. The meeting was extremely profitable to me. The Council had suggested that, perhaps, in the future it might be possible for us, understanding what kind of teachers were required, to encourage undergraduate or graduate students of competence to consider careers in junior college education. They told us they wanted people of high capacity, sensitivity, and taste who had revealed an enthusiasm for learning. They said they were looking for people with postgraduate study, preferably with the master's degree in a discipline, and they would not object if some work beyond the master's degree had been completed. They were not specially interested in people with the Ph.D. degree. Such people, they said, seemed to be too narrowly specialized to find satisfaction in teaching

courses at the freshman and sophomore level. They wanted teachers with an interest in people of undergraduate age, teachers who could relate their disciplines to the whole of learning as offered in a junior college.

Shortly after my return from the meeting I had occasion to counsel with a very talented senior about his career. He was a "G.I.," married with one child, I think, who had revealed great excitement about things intellectual, but had no means or taste for university work through the Ph.D. degree. He knew he didn't want secondary teaching, and he was confused as to his proper goal. I suggested the junior college as a possibility, but it meant almost nothing to him. We pooled our ignorance. He sought more information. He managed to secure a graduate fellowship so he could earn the master's degree and gain some teaching experience at the same time. He was successful and he is teaching today as the chairman of the language department at Colby Junior College. This experience was repeated with nine or more others and with success in each case. I'm convinced that if those of you who counsel with graduate students (or undergraduates) with respect to careers in teaching learn enough about opportunities in junior colleges you can help many of your charges and give great assistance to junior colleges as well. This conference is, of course, an attempt by NEBHE to fill in some of the blanks.

There are, I am sure, among many young men and women of competence who enjoy the intellectual life, many who would object to making the scholarly penetration required in Ph.D. programs. These people, if they possess the personality and character traits needed for successful teaching, might be best placed in junior college teaching posts. They would not be as impatient with freshmen and sophomores as highly specialized products of the graduate schools are known to be. They would be tolerant of the breadth of learning expected in junior colleges. They would be happy working with young people and not unhappy because they were not spending their time in laboratory or

library in pursuit of their special intellectual interests. They should be enthusiasts for their special intellectual interests, but for the purpose of sharing them rather than for polishing or sharpening them. I have no quarrel with any doctor of philosophy, nor, for that matter, with any doctor of medicine or law. I'm discussing the qualities which seem essential in the successful junior college teacher.

I'm content that the information furnished me and others by the NEJCC several years ago is valid. It has "proved out" in nine or ten cases to the advantage of the individuals concerned and the junior colleges in which they have taught. I am satisfied, too, to the extent permitted by two years of experience as a junior college president, that the prescription is sound. It is working for us at Westbrook Junior College.

FACULTY FOR A TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

HAROLD BENTLEY
President, Worcester Junior College

In discussing the question of the teaching of technical subjects one could be easily tempted to roam further away from that which most of us consider to be this area of education.

A good accountant in business has a high technical ability, as does any person who uses communication, whether it be oral, written, or graphic. Languages require great technical ability for their mastery. The field is limitless.

For our purpose, however, we shall think of technical education as that which is in close relationship to our modern technology, particularly in industry. We repudiate the idea that technical competence is merely a matter of manual dexterity. And we hasten to insist that good technical education is a complex rather than a simple learning process.

Technical education covers a wider field than emphasis in particular skills. Naturally, we realize that there is more emphasis on the tangible rather than the abstract in the work of the technician. We must admit that a teacher of technical subjects chiefly deals with the manipulation of matter, inert or active. He certainly produces students who are capable of operating machines, processes or materiel, or all three.

Yet he must do much more than produce for society a person who is merely skilled or competent in these matters. The technical educator today must influence mind as well as hand.

He must develop persons as well as employees. With a heavier concentration on job mastery than either business

or liberal arts studies require, the teacher must still produce men who can enter not only into the line of machine operations, but also adjustment to people, organization, and technological developments that are constantly demanding flexible outlooks and versatile achievements.

In our school we like to think of our technical students not as finished products, but as "finishable" products who will adjust to a variety of possibilities in the vocation they choose. They do not merely have a skill to market. Rather, they have an understanding of enough basic principles in their area of studies so that they can be placed in any of several categories and make their way in a company through more than one avenue of development.

For this type of educational emphasis we need a special kind of teacher. He must be professionally as capable as are our teachers in Liberal Arts, the Sciences, Business Administration, or Accounting. He must have his degree or degrees. If he has only a Bachelor's degree, he will be encouraged and urged to obtain his Master's degree. This will increase his competence because the knowledge gained will be recent and relevant in this swiftly moving age of technological change. He should definitely be educated by the mental discipline of academic achievement.

However, we look for a man who has also had industrial experience as well as education in his field. He should have been present when his academic training was put to the test. He should have shared not only the accomplishments of modern industry or business, but also the failures and disappointments that occur when theories are transformed into practice.

He should know the humility of accepting the logic of circumstance as well as the logic of thought. He should have had a job or a position that was part of a greater enterprise than his interest in a subject.

Naturally, he should be excellent in mathematics, not just good. He should have no blunted instrument in this field. He will have to apply mathematics at every step of

the way as he teaches. Because of this he should know what is meant by applied mathematics as well as by pure mathematics at the technical level. His students should know that in this he is ahead of them because he has already put it to use in experience where the product was crucial in everyday life. and where failure cost more than rank in class or the need to repeat a course.

Our English teachers. our teachers of History. and even our Economics teachers can do very well within the field itself. Many are masters of the subject. and possibly little more. The technical teacher should know his subject within the total field of whatever enterprise he has engaged in. This leads me to my next point.

A technical teacher should know the whole related field of industry as much as possible. He should use his area of competence within the wider context of the industry. and even the economy. This knowledge. undoubtedly learned when he was employed. was the thing that made him more than an employee or a workman. It made him an objective appraiser of his specialty and of his position in the whole industrial scheme. Often this was enough to make a man want to teach while he was still in industry. The thinker in industry. not engaged in research. can be a potentially good teacher.

The teacher in technical subjects should be articulate with both mouth and hands. He should have manual competence with tools. He should be able to lead the student to the skillful manipulation of tools and equipment and should be conversant with their usage in the technologies for which the student is being trained. He should not only be able to show students the usage of tools and equipment. but also the processes within which they have relationships. Always he should be able to demonstrate more than the immediate and specific application.

In teaching his students he should know that there is a difference on the one hand between those who belong to the learn-by-looking school. the copiers, those who only

know how — and on the other hand those whom we speak of as verbal men. Those who can put ideas into words. who can take basic principles and illustrate them until they live in the minds of the students. This is the man who knows why. and also why others should know why.

The instructor in this area should be able not only to talk about his subject in the classroom. but also to talk to the minds of his students so that they not only get his knowledge. but his philosophy of work. application. and interpretation at every possible step in the learning process. A lot of his real contribution is in rest periods or between classes.

He should like people. This means that he should be able to lead inadequacy to adequacy without giving a sense of superiority. and he should be able to appraise and point out a student's growth in understanding without encouraging a false sense of importance in the learning process.

He should be aware of more than technology. He should know ideas and events. In other words he should be an educated man with a technical ability that is worth transmitting to others along with points of view that reinforce the best aspects of our free-enterprise world.

Somehow he should be able to help these students of his to think as well as observe. to see concepts as well as construction, to understand relationships as well as specifics. He will quickly get his students to realize that they are taking a number of clearly defined steps in understanding and competence. each of which will need to be mastered as part of a whole developmental program.

In other words the teacher for which I look should know specific and broad principles. he should be well educated with a practical emphasis. He should have industrial experience if possible. but also the desire to develop others in skills and knowledge. His ability to articulate should arouse a learning response which will look upon competence and commitment as integral parts of an education.

Where do we find this paragon of both virtue and value? There is no line waiting to get admission to our teaching staff. Many times we have to settle for men who lack one or more of these attributes. Our solution to the problem so far has been to select the man who when he comes to us has both education and ability in the large or the small degree.

But when he does come to us he should find an organization that will give him much help. Its philosophy should be clear and possible of realization. His dean will be alert to note and stress the better trends in the field.

The faculty he joins should be well balanced so that it can supplement and reinforce any inadequacies he has. He should become part of a learning situation which is not only student centered but faculty centered. Every device and method should be used by the school itself to make him a man who will produce skilled, efficient, accurate technicians who are the broad base of our expanding economy.

FACULTY FOR A COMMUNITY COLLEGE

THOMAS E. O'CONNELL
Director, Berkshire Community College

We are looking for good teachers for Massachusetts' new system of state-supported community colleges. For that reason there hardly could be a conference better suited to our needs than this one. If ever a conference were ideally designed to be helpful to someone, it is this conference to this fellow. Since I have just been appointed Director of the first of our two-year community colleges to be founded by the Board in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, next September (the college will be called Berkshire Community College). I am particularly hopeful that I can get a few good leads on potential faculty members from some of the graduate school people represented here. I might say to the representative of Radcliffe who asked where she might send suggestions as to good junior college teachers: "I am your man! I hope that you will feel free to send my any suggestions you may have."

It seems to me that it might be fitting for me to announce at this time before this group the name of the individual who will be coming to work for the Board of Community Colleges in Boston as the principal staff person for the Board with the title of Executive Director. The Board has appointed Mr. Walter M. Taylor, presently Director of New Junior College and a man who is known to many of you, to serve as its Executive Director in my place starting at the end of this academic year. Mr. Taylor will bring real strength to the state community college organization here in Massachusetts and I personally could not be more delighted with his appointment.

A word about our Berkshire Community College plans: the first year we shall have three programs, a Liberal Arts Transfer program, a program for Electrical Technology,

and a program for Business. We plan to have about a hundred and twenty-five students the first year and after that we will be able to grow to something like five hundred in the facilities which we will use at the outset. We have a brochure on our community college, and I have brought copies to this meeting. I might mention one other important aspect of our program: we shall be offering all of our technical students at least fifty per cent of their courses in general education. That is, our Electrical Technology and Business people will have at least half of their courses in the sciences, the social sciences and the humanities. Particularly, to those of you who are interested in liberal arts education, this aspect of the community college program may seem important.

One way in which our Berkshire Community College program differs from those of the other institutions represented on this panel is that we shall be coeducational. Our first student was accepted the other day and she came to Boston to be congratulated by Governor Furcolo. We selected a girl to be the first student because we found a young lady who is typical of the kind of student we will be able to serve. We also chose a lady since we hoped that that would stir up more interest on the part of the young ladies in the Berkshire County area to attend our college. Presently our applications are running about four to one — boys to girls. One member of our Board suggested that the best way to attract more girls was to tell them that this is the ratio! The young lady who was accepted as our first student is one of nine children and she has done extremely well at Pittsfield High School. She would not have planned to go to college had Berkshire Community College not located in Pittsfield next year. One of the most pleasing developments in our college so far to me has been the large number of students of her type who have applied to us but who would not have been able to go to college had they not been able to attend Berkshire Community College. Some of these students with excellent aptitudes and high

standing in their classes are now being given an opportunity that they would not have had if our Board had not started its first college in Berkshire County.

As to the search for faculty, there are a number of criteria which we are considering. Of course, like all junior colleges we look for a primary commitment to teaching. This does not mean that we are not interested in having our people do some research and publishing and those activities will certainly not be discouraged. On the contrary, they seem to me to be natural concomitants of a continuing interest in a particular discipline. On the other hand, we are not putting our attention on research as do universities.

I am personally desirous of getting as many people with college experience as I can find. But we are not using this as a *requirement* for faculty membership at Berkshire Community College. I am also looking for people who, in my opinion, will be able to adjust to a fairly wide spread in the aptitudes which they will find in the students before them in the classrooms. While we shall, as I have indicated, have a good number of top-drawer students, those who could attend nearly any institution if they had sufficient funds, we shall also take some students who would probably not have the aptitudes for admission to some of the more selective four-year institutions. A teacher who faces a classroom with this spread in aptitudes must be aware of the existence of the spread and he or she must be prepared to deal with it effectively.

I am also looking for people who are willing to take on reasonably heavy guidance duty. Guidance is, as you all know, one of the areas which community colleges traditionally have stressed. We shall have some full-time guidance people as we move on with our program. But from the outset we shall have to have our full-time faculty people take on fairly heavy assignments in the guidance of students.

We are looking for people who have reasonable versatility. For example, our social science people should be

able to spread over more than one of the disciplines in social science — say, psychology and sociology. And if such a person were to have a wide background in French and an avocational interest in French, we would be pleased to have him able, if necessary, to teach French as well.

Let me in conclusion mention two problems which the Board of Community Colleges is facing right now. I hope that we can get some help from this group on these problems. The first is with respect to faculty rank. Most of you are aware of the fact that most junior and community colleges throughout the country do not have a system of faculty rank. Rather, they call all their faculty people Instructors. The arguments for using this no-rank system are that using faculty rank in junior colleges gets the institution more snarled up than it helps. Such people as Ed Gleazer, and Ken Brunner of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, have advised me that those institutions which avoid using faculty rank avoid intra-faculty jealousy and those that take on faculty rank don't gain much in attracting teachers. The other argument against using faculty rank is that it is difficult to judge what rank should be given to an individual if his publishing and research activities are not taken importantly into account, as they should not be in a junior college.

On the other side, the argument for using faculty rank may be summed up in one word: prestige. Some of the New York State community colleges have recently moved from a no-rank system to a rank system. I talked to the President of one of those colleges about this matter just the other day and he told me that his institution had moved to faculty rank solely because they believed it would give more prestige to the institution and to the individual faculty member who holds, say, a Professor's rank. "It makes the institution seem more like a college and less like a high school," this President said.

Our Board has considered both sides of this question and has asked me to come in with a firm recommendation

on it. Any advice from the floor will be more than welcome.

The other problem which I would like to mention to you is an even more delicate one. But the Chairman of this panel has suggested that we be candid with one another and lay our current problems right on the table. Here is one of ours. What do we do about degree requirements for faculty? As some of you know, we in Massachusetts in the community college system are on exactly the same salary schedule as the State University and the State Teachers Colleges. However, our degree requirements have not yet been formulated. Some members of our Board simply have suggested that we take on the same degree requirements as those four-year institutions have. But our purposes are not the same, and since our emphasis is not on research, we should surely not *require* that all our full professors have Ph.D.'s. This is a particular problem with respect to our occupational faculty people. The best teacher of electrical technology we can find may have an electrical engineering *license*, but his *degree* accomplishments may be very limited indeed. Shall we preclude this fellow from teaching on our faculty simply because he has not conformed with degree requirements which are really established for a different *kind* of faculty position? Should we not, indeed, take the leadership in putting less emphasis on degrees which many thoughtful educators believe to be anachronistic? On the other hand, if we do not have *some* degree requirements, are we not liable to cause a morale problem in our sister institutions? Faculty member X at the University of Massachusetts and faculty member Y at the State Teachers College may be experiencing difficulty in being promoted to, say, the full Professor rank because they have not completed all their work for the doctoral degree. However, in a neighboring state institution, a community college, they see a person with no more degree accomplishment than they have attained, promoted to Professor and given higher pay than their own. The morale problem here is obvious. Also obvious is the fact that I need help from the floor on

this problem of degree requirements for faculty at our community colleges!

I lay these two problems on the table along with a request for faculty suggestions on the part of any of the four-year institutions present. I am sure we will get some useful suggestions now and in the future that will help us get started with a genuinely needed system of community colleges in Massachusetts.

GRADUATE PREPARATION FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHING

RALPH R. FIELDS, *Associate Dean*
Teachers College, Columbia University

In dealing with our topic today we must of necessity make several assumptions. Let me state those which seem to me pertinent as we think together regarding the preparation of junior college teachers:

1. The task of improving the quality of junior college instruction demands continuing attention. While the need for improving instruction in all colleges is a continuing one, two-year colleges, because they are institutions devoted to offering the opportunity for higher education to a wide variety of students, must give special attention to the quality of instruction.

2. The improvement of instruction calls for continuing in-service efforts no matter how well prepared instructors are to begin with.

3. We face a period where the need for an increasing number of college instructors is a major problem.

4. This need for college instructors will be so great that teachers will have to be recruited from all possible sources. For instance, high school teachers who take advanced work in their subject-matter fields will move into junior colleges, particularly into public community colleges. Teachers from technical and professional employment will have to be recruited for instruction in their specific fields. Graduate schools will have to step up their contribution and this will call for a conscious planning of a specific program for this purpose.

With these assumptions in mind today I shall attempt three tasks:

First, analyze the basic question of what is adequate

preparation for college teaching — and specifically for junior college teaching?

Second, examine what graduate schools are doing about preparing junior college teachers, citing a few examples of programs that are in existence.

Third, pose the major issues regarding graduate preparation for junior college teaching.

Let me turn then to the basic question: What is adequate preparation for college teaching?

In spite of the fact that many very good junior college teachers enter the junior college after having high school teaching experience, in my opinion preparation for high school teaching is not adequate for direct entrance into teaching at the junior college level. Typically the college teacher needs greater depth of subject-matter mastery than the typical high school teacher preparation provides. Furthermore, the junior college instructor needs to become acquainted with the characteristics of college students and the nature of the community college and junior college in which he is going to work. And supervised student teaching is of much greater value when it can be done at the college level rather than at the high school level.

In spite of the criticisms which have been made over the last seventy to eighty years regarding our need to prepare college teachers, little has been done to meet them. For instance, early in the twentieth century Walter B. Pitkin complained that the typical graduate program was poor preparation for teaching because it was too narrow, too oriented for research, and contained no specific preparation for the teaching tasks. He proposed a two-year program beyond the Master of Arts degree for the prospective college teacher. The two years were to be spent in teaching and studying under the supervision of a major professor, with the doctor's degree to be granted on the basis of mastery of the subject field and skill demonstrated as a neophyte teacher under supervision.

Another Columbia professor — and one who served as

Dean of Columbia College for a number of years — Harry Carman. voiced his thoughts regarding the graduate schools as follows: "The majority of them have proceeded on the assumption that knowledge of the subject and ability to do research in a chosen field of interest are sufficient. The requirements for the doctorate have not been changed in general design. The University graduate who is awarded his Ph.D. is recommended for college teaching on his promise as a scholar. Clearly. the basis of the recommendation is that he who knows his subject matter can teach — a belief that persists despite the fact that observation and experience. as Dr. Paul Klapper has frequently remarked. clearly reveal its fallacy."[1]

There have been many other critics of the program for the Ph.D. degree as preparation for college teaching in general. For the purpose of making my position clear for today's discussion let me state that in my judgment the typical Ph.D. program is not the best preparation for teaching at the junior college. It is too specialized for the kind of teaching that the typical junior college teacher needs to perform. The junior college teacher needs a breadth of scholarship in his field. Furthermore. in the typical community college and junior college the instructor will meet a variety of teaching problems as well as a variety of teaching assignments. And besides scholarship in his teaching field he needs specific preparation for his teaching tasks. In my judgment such preparation can be gained through the combination of supervised teaching experience and organized study in education courses. I know. of course. that the role of the School of Education in the preparation of college teachers has not been viewed with great enthusiasm on the part of the graduate faculties in general. However. I believe there are contributions which the professional educator can make to the preparation of college

[1] Harry J. Carman. "The Preparation of Liberal Arts Teachers," a presentation at the Chicago Conference on The Preparation of College Teachers sponsored by the American Council on Education and the U. S. Office of Education, held December 8–10, 1949. (American Council on Education Studies, Series I. No. 42, *The Preparation of College Teachers*, edited by Theodore C. Blegen and Russell M. Cooper. The Council, Washington, D. C., 1950, p. 16.

teachers. Education professors have been studying the problems of learning, including those encountered by late adolescents and young adults at the college level. These are the professors who have been studying the nature of the two-year college and analyzing its role as an institution. These are the professors who have been studying the problem of organizing a program of instruction within such community junior colleges and the instructional problems which are to be met in such institutions. To me, the task of preparing college teachers belongs primarily in the subject-matter department, but I do feel that the scholarship of the professional educator has something to add to such a program.

These, then, are my views in general terms of what constitutes adequate preparation for college teaching. Let us turn more specifically to the question of what preparation is adequate for junior college and community college teaching.

One of the very basic and very specific questions is whether teaching at the junior college level is different from high school teaching on the one hand and university teaching or upper level college teaching on the other. There are, of course, many similarities. However, there are some differences which are related to the students to be taught, the kind of scholarship needed, and the types of outside-of-class responsibilities which teachers face. Let me take a moment on each one of these topics.

There are some real differences between junior college students and high school students. High school students typically are in their adolescence while on the average junior college students have emerged from the adolescent period. In general high school students tend to be much more unsettled emotionally, for though junior college students still have their ups and downs the gyrations on the whole are much less violent. Furthermore, the junior college student has a more clearly defined career plan. Occupational motivation, therefore, becomes a very prominent part

of his drive for learning. Even though there may be changes in his occupational plans, career motivations are very strong.

The greater maturity of the junior college student means that most of the discipline problems of the secondary school are not typically encountered in junior colleges. Furthermore, since attendance at college is a voluntary act the student body tends to be more selective in social and occupational and motivational terms as well as in intellectual ones. And there is considerable intellectual selectivity, even though not nearly so much as the typical four-year college or university. The average intelligence quotient for entering high school students hovers around the average for the population, 100. High school graduation, however, is a much more selective process than some of our critics have realized, for the average I.Q. of the high school graduate is around 110. Furthermore, college entrance is another selective process, so that the average college entrant will be around 115.

We must realize, however, that this 115 is for college students around the country. The more able students on the whole attend in greater numbers in the well-known liberal arts colleges and the well-known universities. Junior college populations tend, on the average, to be less able than those of the other institutions of higher education. Consequently there is a wider range of student ability to be dealt with than in the four-year institutions. The task of teaching junior college students calls for an individual who can deal with a greater variety of student ability than that facing the typical college and university professor. University students should be completely independent and self-directing, while junior college level students are only reaching toward such independence. Upper-level college students also are more certain of their vocational selections, although the vocational students in junior colleges frequently are very sure of themselves vocationally.

In the area of scholarship the junior college teacher

compared to the high school teacher needs a greater depth. General courses are more advanced than high school courses in the same field. Since the students are much more selective as well as more mature than those in high school, the expectation is that they can advance more rapidly and to a much greater distance than at the high school level. Compared to the unversity professor there are also real differences in the scholarship demanded. University professors many times teach courses only in their very specific field of scholarship. Junior college instructors typically have to teach a variety of courses in their field, and the courses tend to be general or introductory.

There is in the area of scholarship another difference which is critical. The university professor is expected to be a producer of knowledge as well as an organizer and disseminator. He of necessity must be on the frontier in his particular field. The junior college teacher, in contrast, is primarily an organizer and interpreter.

Outside the classroom there are also some differences between junior college and high school. In many situations the high school teacher must be a supervisor; the junior college instructor, on the other hand, is much more frequently found in the role of sponsor of activities. The high school teacher has many guidance duties, such as managing homerooms, giving counsel regarding personal behavior as well as educational problems; the junior college instructor tends to be more of a counselor regarding career and educational matters; on the personal side a man-to-man or woman-to-woman relationship rather than a disciplinary attitude is likely to prevail.

The university professor, in comparison with the junior college teacher, usually is dealing with an individual who has established an interest in the professor's particular field of work. The guidance problems are likely to be related to the profession which the university professor represents, and in this sense they are much more impersonal than the problems on the junior college level.

There are some differences also in community contacts. Public junior colleges, like public high schools, tend to be a part of the community, and therefore require a relationship with community groups not to be found in typical university affairs. On the other hand the junior college instructor typically is dealing with adults as adults rather than as parents; that is, he teaches adults and he works with adults on community problems, but he rarely meets with the adults as parent groups.

To sum up, it seems to me that the junior college instructor must understand junior college student problems much more than the university professor must understand the problems of his students, but he doesn't face the discipline problems attendant to adolescent behavior. The junior college instructor needs a depth of scholarship beyond the high school teacher in general, but he doesn't have to be the specialist nor the researcher that the university professor of necessity must be. The junior college instructor has to be a counselor as well as a teacher, but on a fairly mature level rather than the adult-to-adolescent level of the high school. These differences seem to point to several differences in preparation.

First, with respect to scholarship, the junior college teacher needs at least a Master's degree in the teaching field, preferably more. This depth and mastery are imperative, for only the scholar can teach at the college level. If the teacher's area is not the typical academic one it may be that his mastery will come from a different source than study at the University, but nonetheless each instructor must be a master of his field. Furthermore, he must be knowledgeable in a field rather than in one specific segment. For instance, in social science the community college teacher needs broad scholarship to teach such courses as principles of sociology or community problems, rather than the specialization called for in criminology or urban sociology.

Second, the junior college teacher needs specific preparation for understanding junior college students. This may

be attained through organized study of the psychology of college student groups and through association with this age level.

Third, the junior college instructor needs specific preparation for his job as teacher. I would mention specifically an understanding of psychology of learning, an acquaintanceship with the history, philosophy, and purpose of higher education and with the community college or junior college as an institution, a course in curriculum and instruction in his major field and supervised teaching at the junior college level.

Let's turn briefly to look at what the universities are doing about preparing junior college instructors. It is perhaps helpful at the outset to note that there are three different kinds of junior college teachers. First, there are those who work in the academic fields. These instructors are quite similar to those who work at the freshman and sophomore levels in four-year colleges and universities in that they will have been prepared largely in the graduate faculties of arts and sciences in the universities. Second, there are those in professional fields such as agriculture, nursing, engineering, business, library, social work, education, and the like. Most of these will have been prepared in the university professional schools. Third, there are some junior college teachers in fields such as hotel catering and management, construction technology, and the like, who will have gained their major knowledge from experience rather than organized university study. These latter are found more frequently in the large public community colleges which developed diversified offerings.

There is an increasing amount of attention being paid to the problem of preparing junior college instructors. Several universities have announced programs, and some actually have programs in operation. In practically all of these there is cooperation between the school of education and the graduate faculties of arts and sciences or the faculties of professional schools. In all of the cases that I

know about, the attention to the need for junior college instructors has been initiated by a professor in the school of education who has become involved with junior college work. For instance, at the University of California at Berkeley there is Leland Medsker; at the University of California at Los Angeles, B. Lamar Johnson; at the University of Texas, James Reynolds; at the University of Michigan, Algo Henderson; and at Teachers College there are several of us quite interested in this area, Walter Sindlinger, Lennox Grey, Erling Hunt, as well as myself.

We have time only just to mention what some of the institutions are doing. Stanford University used to have majors in various teaching fields who were working with the School of Education to prepare for junior college teaching. I am not aware of just what is there at the present moment, but since Stanford will undoubtedly have a junior college professor to carry forward their work in junior college administration as a part of the Kellogg Project, it is quite likely to put increasing emphasis on the preparation of instructors. The College of the Pacific has inaugurated a program for the doctorate which represents a fine example of cooperation between the School of Education and the instructional fields. The person works in his major field of teaching, but takes some work in the School of Education and then formulates a research project under joint sponsorship which stresses some problem of teaching his particular subject.

The University of Texas has had for some time a two-year program for the specific purpose of preparing junior college teachers. At the University of California at Los Angeles the program includes professional education and also includes supervised teaching at the junior college level. The University of Michigan represents an example of a cooperative program between the graduate department and the School of Education. Seminars and the utilization of graduate assistant experience highlight this program. The University of Oregon has had for some time a minor in

higher education which a candidate for the Ph.D. could declare if he were interested in preparing himself for teaching in college. At Teachers College we have two programs: one which centers around the Master's degree in the teaching field plus some additional preparation, and another which centers around the Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree. In the first program the student takes his Master's degree and, it is hoped, approximately an additional year of preparation. This gives the prospective college teacher the opportunity of taking approximately a year to a year and a half of advanced graduate work in his teaching field and in addition the professional preparation for junior college teaching which we have developed. This latter consists of approximately a half year's work in which there is provision for the student to select courses from among those in the psychology of learning or the psychology of college-age youth, the history of higher education, a course on the community college, one on curriculum and teaching in institutions of higher education, and a course in the teaching of his major field. Student teaching or internship at the junior college level completes this program.

The doctoral-level program is developed on top of a Master's degree in the teaching field of the candidate. Approximately two years of work above the Master's degree are planned, about half of which is in the teaching field and about half in education. In addition to the work mentioned above, the student will add whatever are the college and departmental requirements for the Ph.D. or Ed.D. and will do his research on some educational problem related to college teaching in his area of specialization. At this very moment the faculty at Teachers College is contemplating some proposed changes for the pattern of work leading to the Ed.D. degree in order to give more flexibility for the person interested in college teaching. The proposal would enable the person to spend somewhat more time in his teaching field and to participate in an expanded internship program of supervised teaching.

Let us turn very briefly to a consideration of the major issues in connection with the preparation of teachers for junior colleges. It seems to me that there are three major ones, each with several problems focusing on it.

The first issue can be simply stated as "How much?" Amplified, this issue seems to revolve around what level or what degree of preparation should the prospective junior college teacher plan on? For instance, is the Master's degree sufficient? In answer to this question I would take the position that the Master's degree in the teaching field should be considered as the absolute minimum for entering teaching at the junior college level.

The second question related to this issue is, "Is the doctorate desirable?" If the doctorate referred to is the Ph.D., then it seems to me a matter of supply and demand. I really do not believe that the Ph.D. can be expected for the typical junior college teacher during the next decade. Also, as I have said before, I do not believe the Ph.D. pattern to be the best preparation for the prospective junior college teacher. If it is the Ed.D. that is referred to, we also have some problems. First of all, supply and demand will make it unlikely that the majority of teachers preparing for junior college work will take full three years or more of preparation before their first teaching. There is also the question of the suitability of the degree, for in many institutions that do not have large faculties in the various fields of teaching there are not available scholars who are interested in cooperating on a program in education for the preparation of college teachers. Unless the school of education and the graduate faculties can work together enthusiastically in such a program the Doctor of Education degree cannot become an appropriate degree for the potential college teacher.

A third question related to "how much?" is "Is a New Intermediate Degree Emerging?" I would say, "Yes, but very slowly." Several Institutions are using a two-year degree, but the lack of agreement on a name is one major problem holding back progress in this direction.

A second issue which occurs to me can be stated. "What Kind of Scholarship Is Needed?" I believe I have discussed both the breadth and depth of scholarship needed by junior college teachers sufficiently to indicate that there are some real problems in this area. An additional question regarding scholarship is. "What Kind of Research Preparation Should Junior College Instructors Have?" My own feeling is that preparation for research is an essential for a college teacher, but that it can be either preparation for research in the field of teaching or preparation for research on the problems of teaching. We dreadfully need more knowledge about how to teach effectively and much research needs to be carried on by those teaching in colleges.

Another question regarding scholarship is, "How Can Teachers' Scholarship Be Kept Alive?" Immediately come to mind questions regarding leaves of absence, sabbatical leaves, summer employment, summer study, teaching loads, etc. Here I have time only to indicate that it is my belief that we have not paid enough attention to the matter of how junior college teachers can be helped to lead productive, scholarly lives, and that it is high time we gave increased attention to this question.

The third issue is the most controversial of all: "How Can Specific Teaching Skill Be Acquired?" All would agree, I take it, that teaching under supervision is one way of fostering the development of such skill. Assistantships, student teaching, internships — all these opportunities need to be utilized to the full.

I think I have also indicated today that I feel that organized study of learning and teaching problems can help. I know, of course, that there are many who do not feel this way, but I have always wondered why scholars in the academic disciplines sometimes seem to ignore the need for scholarship in the professions. My own feeling is that we need more scholarship devoted to the problem of improving instruction and in helping to achieve better answers to the question of how to prepare college instructors more adequately.

SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION IN GROUP I:

Identifying Promising Junior College Teachers

There was questioning whether identifying junior college teachers was different from identifying those for other categories. A major factor lies in the fact that each college knows the qualities and qualifications for which it is looking. Representatives from public schools felt that for them the spread of teaching area is more extensive, that some background in teaching methods is essential and that previous experience in public school teaching is valuable for some institutions.

Commercial junior colleges draw their teachers primarily from high school sources. Liberal arts junior colleges rely on personnel selected from the four-year college area. Vocational and technical two-year colleges such as Worcester also place major emphasis on a liberal arts background and draw more teachers from this area first than anywhere else. In any event the personal interview is of telling importance. In five instances junior colleges have watched their own students and later brought them to their faculties, thus securing the double advantage of experience on both the two- and the four-year levels.

There was unanimity that a Master's degree in the discipline of an individual's undergraduate major was of much greater value than an M.A. from a graduate school of education. A teaching candidate's motivation, attitude, and interest count heavily as opposed to one who regards a two-year teaching experience as a steppingstone to a university appointment.

Above all the student in the two-year college and his needs are an essential criterion. He needs and the two-year college supplies in its two years mature, adult teachers.

Junior colleges with largely local students tend to draw their teachers from local sources.

As the discussion developed the representatives from four-year institutions present, who were interested in the discussion, reported that no one from the junior college field had ever come to talk to them or to their students about teaching on the junior college level — contrary to the practice of all other levels of education. If they could be so informed their attitudes and approach to counselling toward teaching on the two-year level could readily be modified.

This kind of dissemination of information regarding teaching on the two-year level has been a matter of concern for the past year to the Directors of the American Association of Junior Colleges but to date there has not been personnel available to do it.

It was agreed that teachers at any level need a minimum of professional courses in education at the expense of their subject matter study, but that these are of great value, i.e., Psychology of Learning, Methods of Learning, and The History of Learning.

The four-year college representatives asked for an explanation of a statement frequently appearing on specifications from two-year colleges for needed personnel, "M.A. required, Ph.D. preferred." This was answered with the statements that no teaching inferiority is thereby implied by the junior college; that instead the junior colleges are prepared to say that M.A. depth is adequate for the thirteenth and fourteenth years, though graduate study beyond that may well be of further help; and that conversely the M.A. depth often has concomitant versatility which the frequently narrow specialization of the Ph.D. destroys.

At Newton Junior College the Director, on his own initiative, had offered a course "Teaching in the Junior

College" — the only such course in the area — and had found a lack of understanding both on the part of students and of faculty of the objectives and philosophy of the two-year school. The course had been of great value for those participating.

The discussion ended with strong emphasis on the primary importance of the student as the objective of one's teaching on the two-year level, rather than the teacher's graduate work or research work as an equally or more important ingredient.

SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION IN GROUP II:

Graduate Preparation for Junior College Teachers

The discussion centered around two main questions, the first of which had to do with the degree of teacher training and orientation needed. There were two points of view on this question. One was for a formalized training of junior college teachers, while the other was mildly against it. The arguments in favor were:

a. Although many teachers have been exposed to both good and bad teaching during their formal education, one should be consciously exposed to principles of good teaching rather than hoping it will just rub off.
b. An unwillingness to leave preparation of teachers to self-education only; it should be done with intent.
c. The sink, swim, or flounder philosophy pertaining to a new teacher could be obviated by some formal teacher training.
d. Each junior college is firmly responsible for an orientation period for the new teacher in respect to the particular institution.
e. With too many people knowing too little about junior colleges in general, a course in the history, organization and philosophy of junior colleges should be a must for prospective teachers.

Some arguments against too formal training for the junior college teachers were:

a. The idea of acquiring credits for junior college teaching might run away with itself to the exclusion of subject matter preparation.
b. Any formalized training should carefully avoid regimentation and rigidity.
c. Should not get so regularized that it would be the equivalent of a certificate to teach.

The second main question which the group dealt with had to do with the kind of program that teacher training institutions should offer to junior college bound teachers. Points expressed on this subject were:

a. As mentioned above, the inclusion of a course in the history, organization and philosophy of junior colleges.
b. Another course is the psychology of the junior college age level student rather than the high school.
c. Much was said pertaining to internships or practice teaching. This was tempered with the comments pertaining to the high cost of practice teaching.
d. One remark dealt with the fact that certain practice teaching experiences can be handled almost with equal effectiveness in groups as contrasted with individual experiences. An example was given — teaching materials. It was further suggested that the combination of class internships and joint internships might be effective and economical.
e. There is a very urgent need for the inclusion of tests and measurements.
f. Junior college personnel present expressed great interest in having interns on their campuses.
g. One remark cautions the group against closing the door to people who would make excellent teachers but who would not have had the professional preparation.

Two questions came up which were not discussed because of the time limitation: "What can you do to get away from the high school concept?" and "What about administrators?"

SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION IN GROUP III:

Faculty Development in the Junior College

Discussion centered on three main themes.

First: there is a problem (so far as the development of the faculty is concerned) because of the differences between full-time and part-time faculty members. Group interest varied here because the several faculties represented ranged from those with no part-time teachers to those with essentially nothing else but part-time teachers. There was discussion and general agreement that part-time people should be included in orientation programs and in departmental and general faculty meetings. Dr. Gleazer predicted flatly that the use of the part-time teacher would increase greatly at all levels of our educational system.

Second: there is a problem of adjustment on the part of both teacher and non-teacher to the fact that teaching in a junior college is different from teaching in either a senior college, a university, or a secondary school. Specifically mentioned here as needs of the present junior college as we know it were these points: A. Course assignments should be alternated for the sake of economy and stimulation of interest: B. Regional associations of teachers, by subject-matter area, should be encouraged: C. The junior college teacher ought to be an active participant in community affairs; D. Wherever possible, both faculty and student body members should participate in industrial research projects; E. More junior colleges should consider the advisability of granting sabbatical leaves; and F. The *Junior College Journal* might be used to better advantage by faculties as a base for discussion and possible self-study.

Third: the main problem areas, as seen by Dr. Gleazer, include these:

1. Differences between full-time and part-time faculty members with respect to training, experience, availability, etc.
2. The adjustment problem, particularly with regard to the fact of teaching at basic college levels rather than at advanced levels, and also with regard to the fact that many junior colleges need teachers able to teach in two or more related (but different) subject areas.
3. The in-service training need connected with non-teaching duties, such as dormitory supervision, recreational supervision, community survey work, public speaking, and the like.
4. The tremendous need for trained personnel caused by the tremendous development of hugh state programs for junior colleges at the same time that other levels of education are competing for the same people.
5. The implications for any definition of faculty load if large in-service programs and large numbers of new teachers are employed.
6. Backgrounds vary considerably, and points of view differ widely. This seems to be particularly true of the junior college that draws its support, its faculty, its students, and its curriculum from the local or area needs, in contrast to the senior college or university with the curriculum supported by long tradition.

CONFERENCE ON FACULTY PERSONNEL
for the
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES
Tufts University
May 26, 1960

Roster of Participants

AUSTIN, EUGENE, President, Colby Junior College, New London, New Hampshire

BELL, DOROTHY M., President, Bradford Junior College, Bradford, Massachusetts

BENTLEY, HAROLD, President, Worcester Junior College, Worcester, Massachusetts

BIGSBEE, EARLE M., Dean, Junior College of Connecticut, University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Connecticut

BISHOP, JOAN F., Placement Director, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts

BLEWETT, EDWARD Y., President, Westbrook Junior College, Portland, Maine

BOWKER, JOHN G., Dean of the Faculty, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont

BRUNNER, KEN A., Specialist for Associate Degree and Related Programs, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

FARNUM, PAUL E., Deputy Commissioner of Education, New Hampshire Department of Education, State House, Concord, New Hampshire

FERRY, FREDERICK C., JR., President, Pine Manor Junior College, Wellesley, Massachusetts

FIELDS, RALPH, Associate Dean, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

FISHER, SANFORD, L., President, Fisher Junior College, Boston, Massachusetts

FLANAGAN, WILLIAM F., Director, Division of Graduate Studies, Rhode Island College of Education, Providence, Rhode Island

FLEMING, THOMAS F., Vice President of the College, Becker Junior College, Worcester, Massachusetts

FROST, GEORGE E., Director, Holyoke Junior College, Holyoke, Massachusetts

GILLESPIE, JOHN, Assistant to the President, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts

GLEAZER, EDMUND J., JR., Executive Secretary, American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C.

GOODSON, MAX, Dean, College of Education, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts

GUINDON, FRANCIS X., Assistant Director, Division of State Teachers Colleges, Massachusetts Department of Education, Boston, Massachusetts

HALLENBECK, EDWIN F., Director, Office of Institutional Research, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island

HARRIS, CHARLES P., Director of Field Services, Massachusetts Council for Public Schools, Boston, Massachusetts

HARTUNG, ERNEST W., Dean-Elect of the Graduate School, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island

HERDMAN, DONALD L., Professor of Education, Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut

HOBSON, FRANK, Acting President, Dean Junior College, Franklin, Massachusetts

IRVINE, WILLIAM L., DEAN, University of Maine in Portland, Portland, Maine

JONES, GLADYS B., President, Garland Junior College, Boston, Massachusetts

KEILY, HELEN J., Dean, State Teachers College at Salem, Salem, Massachusetts

KERBY-MILLER, WILMA, Dean, Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Massachusetts

KING, THOMAS C., Dean, College of Education, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont

MACKAY, CHARLES B., Assistant Director, Master of Arts in Teaching Program, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island

MALLOY, MATTHEW J., President, Chamberlayne Junior College, Boston, Massachusetts

MAZZOLA, MICHAEL C., Dean of Faculty, Franklin Technical Institute, Boston, Massachusetts

MEAD, LEONARD C., Vice-President, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts

O'CONNELL, THOMAS, Executive Director, Community College Board, State House, Boston, Massachusetts

PACKARD, RICHARD M., Acting President, Lasell Junior College, Auburndale, Massachusetts

PETERSON, M. K., President, New Haven College, New Haven, Connecticut

PETRICH, PAUL, Lecturer in Education at Dartmouth and Principal of the Hanover High School, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire

ROMIG, ELEANOR C., Dean, Pine Manor Junior College, Wellesley, Massachusetts

RYDER, KENNETH C., Dean of Administration, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts

SACKETT, EVERETT B., Dean of Students and Professor of Education, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire

SCHAUGHENCY, H. W., President, Roger Williams Junior College, Providence, Rhode Island

SHEA, THOMAS H., Acting Director, Research Office, State University of New York, Albany, New York

SHIBLES, MARK R., Dean, College of Education, University of Maine, Orono, Maine

SPENCER, W. C., Professor of Higher Education, New York University, New York, New York

SWAN, PAUL R., President, Leicester Junior College, Leicester, Massachusetts

TAYLOR, Walter M., Director, Newton Junior College, Newton, Massachusetts

WELLER, ROBERT C., President, Mitchell College, New London, Connecticut

WHETTEN, N. L., Dean of the Graduate School, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut

WHITE, KENNETH P., Dean, Newton Junior College, Newton, Massachusetts

WITHEY, RAYMOND A., President, Green Mountain College, Poultney, Vermont

WOODSIDE, GILBERT L., Dean of the Graduate School, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts

NEBHE Staff:

ROBERT H. KROEPSCH, *Executive Secretary*

KEVIN P. BUNNELL, *Research and Administrative Associate*

JOHN W. GUSTAD, *Director, College Teacher Program*

MISS DAIVA B. KUODIS, *Secretary*